

856.g. 6  
7  
A Serious  
**SEARCH**  
INTO  
Jeremy Ives's *Questions*  
TO THE  
**QUAKERS:**

Who are herein cleared from his  
Scornful Abuses,

And *Jer. Ives* himself manifest to be  
NO CHRISTIAN from his own  
*Observations, Reviling, Ostenta-*  
*tion, &c.*

*By a Witness for Christianity in Faith and*  
Life, George Whitehead.

*His Mischief shall return upon his own Head,*  
Psal. 7. 16.

Printed in the Year 1674.

H

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

A

# Serious Search

INTO

## Jeremy Ives's *Questions to* *the Quakers.*

**S**INCE *Jeremy Ives* his late *Daring Challenge* under Pretext of a *Sober Request*, and his attempting to prove the *Quakers no Christians*, is now changed into *Questions for the Quakers*, which he saith, are grounded upon some *Observations* made upon the *Papers* lately published by *Thomas Rudyard* and one *W. P.* which are pretended *Replies to Jeremy Ives his sober Request to the Quakers*, but will appear by the *Light of the ensuing Observations* (he saies) to be but *idle Shifts and Evasions.*

Seeing he begins at this condemning Rate against us, and vilifying and slighting our Friends Answers, and pretends such *Light* in his own *Observations*; it is needful they

should be inspected and seriously examined; however he reckon his Questions and Observations so very clear and lightsom Proofs against us, I will assure him, we find no such Validity in them to *retort* *on* *us*.

I observe two general Accusations on which his Matter much depends to render the *Quakers no Christians*.

First, *Condemning that in others, which they allow in themselves*.

Secondly, *Disdaining, Huffing, Standering and Reviling*.

Both which I grant with him, are so far from being either Characters of a *Christian*, or Infallible Marks of a Disciple of Christ, that they are wholly inconsistent with *Christianity*.

The first Position is thus to be considered.

For Men to condemn that in others which they allow in them selves, is an Inconsistency and a self-Condernation, where the Matter is the same in every Respect, both as to the Nature and Circumstance; though that which is an Evil in it self is condemnabale, and not to be allowed either in one's self or in another; much more is his Condernation aggravated, who allows that Evil in himself which he condemns in others: Other things that are Lawful in themselves become accidentally



accidentally Evil, through the Abuse or Evil Mind that brings them forth.

But to the second Position; it's granted, that *Disdaining, Huffing, Slandering and Reviling* are evil in themselves, if by *Huffing* he means a *fierce Despising & scornful Slighting* those that are good, or that deserve it not; and by *Reviling*, a *making a worthy Man base, or calling a Man all to naught*: The Truth of it is, *Jeremy*, thou wouldst appear in these Matters a very grave, sober *Christian*, and a Man only for solid and favourable Expressions: But whether thou hast not plaid the Hypocrite in these Pretences of *Seriousness and Christianity*, and brought thy self under the Guilt, both of condemning that in others which thou allowest in thy self, and of *Disdaining, Slandering and Reviling*, will further appear in the following Examination.

Thou sayest, that *these Papers, like all the rest of the Quakers Writings, are stuffed with vain and frothy Expressions*; and what those are thou instances *W.P's* saying, that *the Product of many dayes Travail was but a sorry Mouse [the Product of Jeremy's great Mountain.]* Which was with Reference to thy daring and vapouring Challenge, falsely term'd

by thee, *A sober Request to the Quakers*: But it disgusts thee to use such a Comparison as that of a *sorry Mouse*, and why so? Is it because of the Impropriety of the Speech, or that it is too Ironical for such a grave, sober *Christian* as *Jeremy Ives* would be accounted? But I tell thee, *Jeremy*, thou art one of them that *strains at a Gnat, and swallows a Camel*, whether thou thinkest these Expressions proper or not.

And *secondly*, to prove us guilty of thy *second Position*, thou sayest that *Our Friends Papers abound with Railings and bitter Invectives, thinking to raise thereby a Dust (a plain Falshood) to darken the Understanding of the unwary Reader*; and what are these? In calling thee *Audacious, Privateer, Bravado, Hector, Senacherib, Impudent, &c.*

And further (to shew thy self a very moderate and sober *Christian*) thou sayest, *That these Papers abound with Untruths, thou wilt not break the Laws of good Manners, as they do, to call them LYES and FORGFRIES*; And so that here thy Modesty & Seriousness is such, as when thou hast insinuated, that the *Quakers* are *No Christians*, nor yet Followers of the *Laws of Good Manners*, for Charging their *Adversaries* (such as thou and thy Brother *T. Hicks*) with *Lyes & Forgeries*; but thou

thou wouldst not be thought so to *Unchristian* and *Unmanner thy self*, as to use such Expressions, as *Audacious, Privateer, Impudent, Impudent, Lyes and Forgeries*: Oh demure *Jeremy! Hypocrita cupit se videri justum.*

But first, If he be *No Christian* that condemns that in others which he allows in himself, then is *Jeremy Ives No Christian*.

Secondly, If he be *No Christian* that is guilty of such Language as he himself accounts *Disdaining, Huffing, Reviling, Railing, and bitter Invectives*, as namely, *Audacious, Impudent, Lyes, &c.* and thus to charge another, be *Unchristian and Unmannerly*, then is *Jer. Ives NO Christian*, by his own Observation; But that *Jer. Ives* is herein both *Self-condemn'd & Guilty*, take a View of his Language against us in his Pamphlet, viz. *Men of Lying Spirits, gross Equivocations, idle Shifts and Evasions, Bedlam-man, audacious and ridiculous, daring Prophets, your Baseness, wilful Baseness, pretended Impulses and Enthusiastick Necessities, Lawyers Logick, Figments of thy Fancy, little Witicisms to please thy simple beguiled Clients, this Emperick of the Law Thomas Rudyard, what Impostors, they pretend the Spirit to be the Rule, when they can give no more Evidence of it then Mahomet or Muggleton, the sad*

*Shifts the poor Men are put to, their Enthusiastick Principles, such idle Enthusiasts.*

Thus *Jeremy* lives through his Observations.

Judge Serious Reader; Is not here both Huffing, Disdaining and Reviling, and what he himself hath accounted such? But if *Jeremy* think this not enough to prove himself condemned, and guilty of both Disdaining, Huffing, Reviling and Vanting, let his Salutation to *Arthur Cook* upon the Exchange be added, viz. *Thou Puttful, Fool, thou Knave, thou Loggerhead;* And if to call any Man's Papers *Lyes, and Forgeries,* be a breaking the Laws of good Manners, and to call a Man *Audacious or Impudent, bewray an Unchristian Spirit, and be corrupt Communication,* as he implies, then has *Jeremy* lives both bewrayed an Unchristian Spirit, & hath broken the Laws of good Manners, and condemned that in others which he hath plain'y allowed in himself; for in his Book entituled, *Innocency above Impudency,* he doth not only charge his Opposer with *Impudency,* but he gives him the *Lye* near thirty Times; and likewise in his *Quakers Quaking,* he has shewn his Envy and ill-Language sufficiently. Where art thou now *Jeremy* lives? Art thou not here found guilty, and allowing that in thy self, which thou hast condemned others

others for, as *Unchristian*? And also thy Brother T. Hicks, whose Quarrel thou hast espoused, hath used such Language to some of us, as *Knave, Impudent Fellow, Audacious Fellow, Coxcomb, &c.* which is much like thy *Pittysful Fool, Knave, Loggerhead, &c.* See now *Jeremy*, how thy own Observation and Charge is deservedly retorted upon thy self. Art not thou found a *Huffer* (yea and a *Puffer* too) a *Railer*, a *Scorner* and *Disdainer*, and thinks it a great Disparagement to be accounted short of an *Honest Heathen*; but I must tell thee, that there are many *Heathens* that are a great deal more sober, serious, and fearing God then thou art, as thy Lightness and frothy Deportment at the late Meetings did evince: However, thou braggest of thy being able, by the Grace of God, to approve thy self as *Honest* in all thy Correspondencies in the World as the best of them, and challengest us to produce the Person or Persons that shall say otherwise of thee. How thou art able to approve thy self, and how thou hast approved thy self, have a different Sense: But however, I must tell thee, It had been more proper and more credible for others to have thus commended thy *Honesty*, then to have done it so highly thy self; but as for these Things, it is not my present Business to

to seek or enquire out Occasions against thee in the Concerns of this World; let those speak that are offended, if they have Occasion given them, or have complained of thee, I have enough against thee of other Concerns.

Whereas *Jer. Ives* untruly chargeth our Friends Papers too abound with Untruths, pretending himself so much obliged by the Laws of Good Manners, as that he will not call them Lyes and Forgeries, of which he shall mention but Two, which are,

1. That he pretended to be delegated by T. Hicks, but was not.

2. That in the Dispute, when he was to prove us No Christians, instead thereof he put us to prove our selves Christians.

To prove the first, an Untruth, he sayes, he was concern'd by their Consent, else how came we to direct our Letters to him with Mr. Kiffin and others.

Jeremy, thou art besides the Business here, for thy pretending to be delegated, was in T. Hicks's Cause at the Meeting near Wheeler Street; and that he might be concluded by thee as personating him: Did not this concern those Matters whereof we charg'd him? for thou may'st remember this was urg'd at the Dispute; The Letters to thee and the rest, did not concern thee to personate T.H.

in his Absence there ; but only as an Assistant of him in his Presence amongst the rest ; but that thou wast not so delegated, to personate *Thomas Hicks*, nor that he gave up his Cause to be concluded in *Jer. Ives*, seems evident,

1. In that *Jeremy* and those then with him durst not enter upon the Particulars charg'd against *T. Hicks*, as *Forgeries*, nor would suffer them to be read.

2. In that we have a Certificate to the contrary under *Tho. Chamberlain's* hand, signifying, that *John Gladman* told him, that *T. Hicks* said, That *Jeremy Ives* was not deputed by him.

And to the second ; I wonder that thou canst call this an *Untruth*, that when thou hadst said, *Thou wouldst prove us no Christians*, instead thereof thou call'dst for an *Evidence of our Christianity*, or put us to prove our selves *Christians*, and *W. Penn* to produce *Evidence* to distinguish himself as a true Minister (that hath *Immediate Inspiration* for his Rule) from an *Impostor* ; See the Narrative of that Day's Meeting, from page 52 to page 56. in the taking of which Discourse we had both Careful and Ready Writers ; and I am sure that *Jeremy's* Attempts, to prove us *No Christians*, and *W. Penn* an *Impostor*, did amount to that miserable Shift of calling

calling for an *Evidence* on our parts as before, and he now confesseth, *That he did require an Evidence for the Rule of our Faith and Practice by Inspiration*, pag. 6. And was not this then for an *Evidence* of our *Christianity*, while we do not profess any real *Christianity* without *Faith and Practice by Inspiration*? An *Evidence* of our being *Divinely inspired* must be an *Evidence* of our *Christianity*; for none are true *Christians*, who deny *Divine and Immediate Inspiration*: And I do not understand what *Jeremy Ives* scoffs at us as *Idle Enthusiasts* & for *Enthusiastick Principles*; but for holding this of *Immediate Inspiration*, nor do I see but that his Charge of *Untruth* (in those two things before) is justly to be turn'd upon himself as an *Untruth* against us.

He concludes, *That he might by all Laws of Dispute require Evidence of Inspiration, being the Rule of Faith and Practice*, he would make the World believe that he is very expert in all the Rules of Dispute; but I tell him, It had been more proper and reasonable for him to have required Evidence of our being *Divinely inspired*, as a Man in an enquiring unsatisfied Condition that wants Information, then as one that had given and promised before to prove his positive Charge  
of



*of the Quakers being no Christians.* It was his Part to prove this, or else to have acknowledged his Confident Rashness & Folly; for could he with any Seriousness demand an Evidence of our being inspired of God (when before he had concluded us *no Christians*, and promised Proof thereof) and saith, *At this time we could do no more then Muggleton*, which is a Reviling Asperision: But we are sure it was a sorry Shift in him, instead of proving *the Quakers no Christians*, to put W.P. upon either proving himself a Minister of Christ, or to produce an Evidence for the Rule of his Faith *by Inspiration*; and what that Evidence was he would have besides the Spirit's own self-Evidence, concurring with a Holy Conversation, he did not shew us, but this is like the rest of his uncertain Work against us, to make a *Buz* and a *Noise* in the World, to render such Odious as are more Righteous then himself, as in his Hypocritical, Audacious, Daring Challenge he most falsely accuseth us.

1. Where he saith, *That W. Penn's Confession of his Faith, though in Scripture-Expressions, was but a meer Equivocation.*

2. *That though our Discourses and Confessions of Faith be cloathed with Scripture-Language*

*Language now more then formerly, they are but gross Equivocations.*

3. *That our former Opinions [I suppose, since we were a People] were Vile, Absurd and Nonsensical, and that he proved to our Faces to make Void all Rules of Faith and Christian Practice.*

4. *That by Force of Argument he drove us to that streight, that we could make no Reply.*

5. *He chargeth us with base and insolent Behaviour in his Absence.*

These are notorious Falshoods, and to these two last many Hundreds that were present can testifie the contrary, and that *Jeremy Ives* herein is a most false and ridiculous Boaster.

These Falshoods together with his *daringly challenging & grossly reviling us* in his Paper, are notwithstanding entituled by him, *A sober Request*; but now since we find upon the same Challenge another Title put before this, which is [*Quakers no Christians*] Judge Reader, was this proper to such a Paper, *requesting a Meeting to prove us no Christians?* He and his Bookseller might very well have spared this Title until such Proof had been made, as it might have been proper to, and not thus to cover their beggarly Shifts with  
no-

notorious Untruths, do but see how *Jeremy's* Work hangs together, viz.

*Quakers no Christians.*

*A sober Request to the Quakers.*

*If you dare appoint a Time and Place, &c.*

*I earnestly request a Meeting with you, to prove, That you are no Christians.*

*I require an Evidence for the Rule of your Faith, by Inspiration.*

I know no farther Proof we have as yet from him of his Charge that the *Quakers* are no *Christians*. Is it not easy to see the Absurdity and Folly of these men, and how they make *Lyes* their Refuge, and cover themselves with Falshoods?

For his daring us to appoint Time & Place, he querieth, *If this Phrase signifies any more then if you are not afraid to appoint Time and Place?* As if we could have no other Reason, but being afraid of *Jeremy Ives* to forbear appointing Time and Place to meet him: Oh Insolent, Vain-glorious Boaster! dost thou not know in thy own Conscience and by sufficient Experience, that we have not been afraid of thee? I am ashamed to see such Proud, Insolent and Popular Ostentation and Falshood, and Groundless Insinuations against us under the Profession of *Christi-*  
*anity.* After

After the same rate he further cracks thus, viz. *Whether I had not good Reason to think, you were afraid to hear your selves prov'd No Christians, when all your Wits and Time were chiefly exhausted in two publick Meetings to divert us from the Proof thereof, as Thousands can testifie, pag. 7.*

A most notorious Untruth & gross Abuse, as thousands can testifie ; For,

1. The Baptists Wits & Work was chiefly, to divert us from the pursuit of our Charge against their Brother T. Hicks, contrary to the Agreement upon which the first Meeting was appointed.

2. Hath Jer. Ives and his Brethren so far forgot themselves, as not to remember how their Wits and Time were taken up at both Meetings, especially his in the Latter, to prove the Quakers no Christians, and yet after Jeremy is fain both to Dare us, and earnestly Request a Meeting with us, to prove us no Christians ; which if he had so rarely done at either Meeting before, he needed not thus have Dared and Requested a Meeting, but only have shown the World, How he had done it ; instead whereof he hath given them Ground to believe, that he is baffled in his Attempts, which makes him so swell and belch out Daring and Reviling afterwards.

But

But he takes it for granted, that the right  
*spurred* Christians were more animated and  
 provoked by the Daring of their Adversaries to  
 vindicate the Honour of their Religion; But  
 this is only implied in *Jeremy's* Question  
 instead of any general Proof: It is a Wonder  
 that he and his Brethren were not more pro-  
 voked to vindicate the Honour of their Re-  
 ligion in Behalf of their Brother *T. Huke*, in  
 whom their Religion is so much concerned,  
 as he is set up as an eminent Agent of the  
*Anabaptists*, and Teacher among them; for  
 was not the Honour of the *Baptists* Religion  
 at all concerned in this Person? *J. Ives* will  
 concern the Honour of our Religion in any  
 particular Book of any one among us that he  
 thinks he hath something against; but *Jeremy*  
 let me tell thee, that thy *Daring* hath no such  
 Impression upon our Spirits, as to provoke us,  
 either to meet thee only as *Jer. Ives*, or upon  
 thy own Terms: Nor do we at all reckon the  
 Honour of our Religion impaired, either by  
 thy Daring, Huffing, Reviling or Deriding;  
 but rather we count it Matter of Rejoycing,  
 when such as thou art, revile and speak all  
 Manner of Evil of us, while we know you  
 do it falsely, and that we suffer it for his Name  
 sake, who hath upheld us through Sufferings  
 and Reproaches unto this Day.

*Jeremy Ives*, for Proof of his daring Challenge, and to stop *T. Rudyard*, quotes *Edw. Burrough's* Invitation and Challenge to the whole Church of *Rome*, daring them to suffer a certain Number of Quakers to come among them; and likewise, that he challengeth all the Priests of *Dublin* to meet him to try their God, their Ministry and Worship.

It seems this daring Champion *J. I.* who would be accounted an eminent Warriour for Christianity, must be beholding to such as he counts *No Christians* for Proof of his Challenge, though if his and *Edw. Burroughs* be seriously compared, a vast Difference and Disparity will appear between them, both as to the Nature and Manner of them, and their different Spirits; for *E. B.* did in both plainly and seriously design to oppose the Spirit of Persecution, both at *Rome* and *Dublin*: As to [ *Daring* ] 'tis only a Proposition by Way of Question to the Church of *Rome*, thus, *And dare you suffer a certain Number of us to come among you and preach what we hold, and a certain Number of you shall freely come among us, and preach what you hold without Persecution or any Violence, as we would expect and have the same from you?* And this to try which would convert

vert || the most, and which  
had the Power and Spirit of  
God with them, &c. E.B's  
Works, fol. 470.

|| E.B. being re-  
ally satisfied th y  
could convert no  
real Quaker to the  
Church of Rome.

Now let any Reasonable Man judge  
whether this Proposition for a mutual liberty  
to preach without Persecution, and to see or  
try the Effect of each One's Ministry, was  
not more serious and of another kind than  
*Jeremy Ives's* Daring Challenge, mixt with  
Untruths and Abuses, 'avouring of a Boasting  
Scornful Spirit.

And 2<sup>dly</sup>, for E.B's Challenge to the Priests  
of Dublin to meet him and F. Howgill, to try  
their God, their Ministry and Worship: This  
was when these two were Prisoners in Dublin  
proposed to those of the persecuting Spirit;  
the Reason whereof is plainly given, 'They  
'being under Afflictions and Sufferings, abun-  
'dantly reproached, and the Lord's Truth  
'greatly infamed by many Backbiting and  
'Slandrous Tongues, especially by profest  
'Ministers in the Ears of their People, slan-  
'dering them, as being *Jesuits, Saducers,*  
'*Deceivers, Hereticks, Blasphemers and*  
'*Witches*, Fol. 90 of E.B's Works. See  
here, was it not reasonable that these Sufferers  
should call out for a Meeting to clear them-  
selves

selves from such Infamies and Reproaches in the Presence of their Accusers: Had *Jer. Ives* been under such Suffering by the *Quakers*, and made such a Proposition to them, he might have made this his Instance; but he and his Brethren have not been willing thankfully to enjoy their own Libertties quietly in a Time of Peace, but have endeavour'd to render us (who have ben a suffering People) as Odious and Obnoxious as they can, wherein their Design seems most tending to stir up Persecution against us, like Ungrateful Men.

His other Instance is that of *Solomon Eccles* his Challenge, to fast seaven Dayes and seaven Nights, &c. made to *Papists* and *Protestants* of divers Sorts, as *Presbyters*, *Independents*, *Baptists*, *Fifth-Monarchy Men*, &c.

Though *Jeremy* is pleased to render him like a *Hector* or *Stager*, or rather a *Bedlam-man*: He hath herein condemned him before a Tryal, which he might have forborn until himself or some of his Brethren, had made Tryal; but it is not likely that they would expose themselves, their Bellies, or their God, to such a Jeopardy: However, as to the Ground of *S. E.*'s Confidence, and  
how



How he might have been born up in such a Case, it seems not reasonable that either *Jeremy Ives* or I should determine to the World (whatever we think) while none of them dare adventure upon such a Tryal with him: I must confess, the Prophets of *Baal* i *Kings* 18. were rather to be commended for their Confidence in adventuring the Tryal of their God upon *Elijah's* Challenge, then *Jer.* and his Brethren, though those Prophets of *Baal* had but ill Success: But if *J. Ives* objects that S.E. had no Scripture Instance for such a Challenge, but only an Impulse by Inspiration without Evidence: I reply, neither hath *Jeremy* Scripture to controul him herein, nor durst he adventure upon Tryal for the Proof or Evidence of such an Impulse (Yet *Fasting* is more easily proved in Scripture then *Jeremy's* Challenge) However, it is not reasonable we should send S.E. to *Bedlam* before Tryal, or that he be found so fit for it as *Jeremy Ives* has rendred him.

Another Instance is, *G. Fox* calling the Doctors in Europe to come forth, and meet him in the open Field, and to answer him if they dare; and for this he quotes *A Primer for the Schollars and Doctors in Europe*, in the Epistle

Epistle, p. 4. and in the Book, p. 40 & 41. Wherein J. I. hath unfairly cited the Matter, which is not at all of the Nature of his Challenge; for this *Primer* chiefly consists of Queries upon their seaven Arts & Terms, used in the Universities and Schools of Learning: In the Place cited the Words are truly thus, viz. *These Queries are to call them out into the Field, that every one may see their Garment, that they may give Answer to every one of these Words, Names & Things; let them come out now to little Children; thus in Epist. p. 4. And after divers hard terms about Theology, in p. 40. he queries thus, Whether or no they are the Words that the Holy Ghost hath taught? answer me, if you can, or da e venture, what every Particular of these Words is, and what Center a. d Ground they come from.*

But here are not the Words, *Come forth and meet me in the open Field, and answer me if you dare,* according to Jeremy's Citation.

Now consider what Parallel there can be between G. F's calling the *Senollars* and *Doctors* to come out to little Children, to explain their Terms of Art; and Jeremy's Insulting, Scornful and Reviling Challenge hypocritically named *A Sober Request*; and surely,

surely, the *Schollars* and *Doctors* might have given a sober Answer unto *G. F.*'s *Queries*, and explained their hard Words and Terms of Art, as publickly in Print, in the open Field or Face of the World, without daring them to appointing such a Meeting as *J. Ives* dares and begs for in his Challenge, to prove the *Quakers No Christians*, after he had several Opportunities, and made divers Attempts to do it before: *G. F.* used no such Uncertainty nor Hypocrisie or Envy in his calling out the *Doctors*, as *J. Ives* had done against the *Quakers*, as appears in comparing *G. F.*'s *Primer* (to the *Doctors* and *Schollars* of *Europe*) with *J. Ives*'s *Sober Request to the Quakers*: We value not his Outcry of *Baseness, Railing, and Clamoring, and wilful Baseness*; herein he shews but his fretful Huffing against us, & himself guilty thereof.

As for our own *Prophets* outdoing of him *twenty Times*, as he saith, their outdoing is neither of the Nature of his doings, nor attended with those Circumstances; for his (as hath been told him) is *False, Impertinent and Impudent*: He by daring us rendering us afraid to meet him, which is a gross Untruth, & *Reviling us*, endeavours to make us *Odious* before Tryal, and to vaunt and insult over

us in a frothy light Spirit, which hath evidently appeared in him.

In short: Further to shew the Disparity of *Jer. Ives* his insolent frothy Challenge to the *Quakers*, and our Friends serious Challenge and Propositions to the *Pope, Cardinals*, and other Persecutors, as *T. Rudyard*, in his Book, entitled, *The Anabaptists Printed Proposals*, p. 18, 19. answers *Jeremy* thus, viz. 'If he means by *Sober Request*, that Expression of his, *If you dare appoint Time and Place, &c.* it is past my Skill to find the Correspondency of the Body of his Sheet to its Head or Title; but if *Daring* to appoint be the best Terms the *Anabaptists* can invite us to a *Religious Discourse*, I must declare his Language is so far from being scriptural, that it comes short of the common *Hectors* or *Sword-men* of our Time, &c.

Now *Jeremy's* Daring Challenge shews it self not to be on a Serious Religious Account, nor in the best Terms of Invitation thereto; but rather in this somewhat like the common *Hectors* or *Sword-men* of the Times, that confide in their own Strength and Art (as he doth in his pedantick Knack of sophistical Twisting and Turning in his

Ar.

Arguings) he provides, *That none be admitted to speak (as the Disputants) but himself and another, whom we shall appoint; as also, that a certain Hour be agreed on for the Beginning, and another for the Ending of the Disputation for that day, and that neither Party shall exceed that Time, unless by mutual Consent*: wherein he has very carefully contriv'd his Matter, that he may not be spent, or beaten out of Breath; and as a man that has no super-natural Aid to trust to, being Doubtful that his Natural Strength should fail (in case his single Opposer should not be stinted to a few Hours) which is quite contrary to the Nature of *S. E's* Challenge to Fast; for *Jeremy* provides more carefully for his Carcase in this Case, then *S.E.* doth to be sure.

And our Friends *E. B.* or *G. F's* proposing to many Persecutors, both *Papists* and others, to answer or meet them without such Stint or Limitation of *single Person or hours* (as *Jeremy* would bargain beforehand) argues to me, that they did rather confide in the Power and Aid of God to assist them in their Testimony against their Adversaries; and not in their own Strength or Wisdom of the Flesh, as *Jeremy's* does, which makes me be so careful that both the Time and single

gle Person be stinted and pitcht upon: for otherwise he has Cause to be doubtful, that his God would fail him. I will conclude, that the true God did not call him to give forth such a Challenge as his is; for he hath no Rule nor Authority from the Scriptures for it, nor any Example from Christ's Ministers for such a Daring Vapouring Challenge; nor can he Evidence any special Command for it by immediate Inspiration or Revelation from Heaven (as our Friends profess) for that's inconsistent with his Religion: Therefore his own presumptuous Will is his Rule and Law for his Challenge, both as to the Matter and Manner of it, as having no footing either in the Holy Scriptures or Power of God.

Whereas from his *Daring us* to appoint Time and Place to prove the *Quakers No Christians*, it was told him, that *then it seems they are not yet proved No Christians*; upon which he demands, *whether a Truth may not be ofner prov'd then once, especially where some stop their Ears, as the Deaf Add'r?*

Hereupon I ask him, if he had before proved us *No Christians*, or really judged he did so, Was it proper for him to dare and beg for another Meeting meerly to prove us *No Christians*, which is not again to prove

us none? or did he expect to open our Ears by going over his Matter again? But if he reckoned us such *Deaf Adders*, that would not hear him before, his Business had been rather to let the World know how rarely he had proved his Charge against us, and not to trouble the World, or alarm City and Country with his Cracking and Boasting what he would do in his daring Vaunts, which favour of meer Pride, Vanity and Impudence, and not of any Seriousness, or Good-will towards us; nor as a man that would really seek our Conversion to *Christianity*, supposing us none; for did ever the Apostles or Ministers of Christ thus dare vilifie, reproach or insult over the poor *Ethnicks* or moral *Heathen* (as we are counted) in the sight of their Enemies, or open View of the World in order to their Conversion) as *Jer. Ives* has dealt by the despised *Quakers*?

As touching the Question T. R. put to him, *Whether this be that Jeremy, that was cast into New-gate upon a Religious Account, and for his Testimony against Swearing, in the year 1660.* To this he answereth, *I am not that Jeremy that was committed to New-gate for a Religious Refusing the Oath of Allegiance, &c.*

On which I ask, if it was not for some kind of refusing the *Oath*? and whether if a *Conscientious Refusing*, it was not *Religious*?

But that *Jeremy* got out of Prison by *Swearing*, this he denyeth not; for he saith, *I am that Jeremy, that took the Oath of Allegiance, and writ a Book to prove that some Oathes were Lawful, though all were not.*

Well, I'll not press him, whether he did not once reckon the *Oath of Allegiance* Unlawful (when he was committed to *Newgate*) but tell him, that methinks he doth a little like a *Temporizer*, colour over and construe the *Business* of his Letter to his Brother *Pittman* and Brother *Sewel*.

1. First, in saying, *I am not that Jeremy that ever writ against the Oath of Allegiance, either privately or publickly.*

2. In saying, *I am that Jeremy, that did in a Letter blame a Friend for saying, He had rather have given Fifty Pound then have took the Oath of Allegiance, and yet swore he took it Freely and Willingly, &c.*

By which, *Jeremy*, thou seemest only to strike at thy Brother's *Hesitation*, *Scruple* and *Disimulation* about the taking the *Oath*, and not at the meer taking it, or *Matter of Fact*.

But



But methinks thy severe Letter to them sounds otherwise, as that it was for taking the Oath, as well as their Scruple or Dissatisfaction in doing it; else, what mean these Passages in thy Letter? viz.

*I do well to be angry with you.*

*That you would be as easily perswaded to part with, as unwilling to suffer for your spiritual Liberties.*

*How unlike the Christians in former Times are you, whose Zeal was so hot for God that their Eyes prevented the Morning, that thereby they might prevent the Rage of the Adversary.*

*I always did conclude, that those that would quit the cause of Righteousness, would quit the Wayes of Holiness, as yesterday's sad Experience hath taught, to the perpetual Joy of your Adversaries, and the sadning the Hearts, and adding Afflictions to the Bonds of the Prisoners of the Lord. Thus far Jeremy.*

See here, was it only the Scruple of these Men in taking the Oath that is opposed or reproved, and not their taking it? Or was it the Regret they had upon them in the taking it, that would be such a perpetual Joy to the Adversaries; or rather the Matter of Fact, as it appeared to them, namely, the taking

taking the Oath, and therein acting contrary to the Testimony of others that suffered, to the sadning their Hearts, and adding to their Afflictions? Besides, saith *Jeremy*, *My Bonds are my Crown, but your Cowardly Spirit is my great Cross*: But it seems he kept this Crown but a little while, if he in a few Dayes after got himself out of Prison by Swearing: And wherein did their Cowardly Spirit appear, but in their Swearing, contrary to their Consciences, as *Jeremy* in his chiding Letter saith?

Now God is proving to see if you will obey him or no; and did not yesterday's Work witness that you are willing to prefer the Fear of a Man that must dye, before the Fear of the great God; and the Fear of them that can kill the Body, before the Fear of the Lord that can cast both Body and Soul into Hell? I have no more to say but this, that your Cowardly Temporizing and Complying with the PRECEPTS OF MEN, makes me jealous, that your Fear towards the Lord is taught by the Precepts of Men. Thus far *Jeremy* again.

Now the Question is, did J. I. in all these Words bear upon their *Hesitation* or *Scruple* in taking the Oath, or only reprove their Swearing they took it freely, when they could

could not really do it? Methinks, if this had been the Thing, and that *Jeremy* had really allowed of the Matter of Fact it self, as *the taking the Oath*, he should have writ in another Strain then he did unto his Brethren for taking it; he should not have charged them for quitting the Cause of Righteousness to the Perpetual Joy of the Adversaries; nor with adding Afflictions to the Bonds of the Lord's Prisoners; nor with yesterday's Work, witnessing their Willingness to prefer the Fear of a Man that must dye; nor of Cowardly Temporizing and Complying with the PRECEPTS of Men: for surely, here is the Matter of Fact concerned; but if he had approved of the Oath it self, and only disapproved of their Weakness in scrupling and taking it in an unsatisfied Conscience or doubtful Mind, he should then have endeavoured to have removed their Scruples, and to have pacified their weak Consciences with urging the Lawfulness of what they did, by demonstrating it to them; but the Thing appears otherwise, and that *Jeremy* did fall under the Judgment that he gave against his Brethren, as namely, that of Cowardly Temporizing and Complying with the Precepts of Men; as may be suspected from his saying,

What

What if I had been once against the Oath, & afterward had took it, must this needs make me an Impostor?

Surely this doth not clear him, nor render him a Stable Christian.

His implying or insinuating *Tho. Rudyard* guilty of *Forgery*, for putting *Mens Names* to own the Matter in a Book without their Consent or Privacy, p. 7. & 11.

I suppose *Tho. Rudyard* hath answered for himself to this Matter elsewhere, viz. to a Paper of *T. Hicks* that charged him with the same Fact: And for my Part I do not understand that he his chargeable with *Forgery* herein, though he had not their Consent or Privacy, seeing their Names were sent up Inhabitants then present (with divers others) at the Examination of the *Anabaptists Lying Wonder* in *Lincolnshire*, that *Richard Anderson* (untruly insinuated to be a *Quaker*) whose Child was falsely alledged to be cured of a *Leprosie* by Means of the *Baptists Prayers*; and the Certificate being sent up to him with the Names of those then present and Ear-Witnesses of that Account, and others that subscribed their Hands, as further *Witnesses* thereto; whether they consented to the publishing of their Names to the Man's Account

count or not; was not material, so long as they knew the Thing was true; & what Reason had T. R. or any others, to think that they would scruple their Names being printed (as *Persons present*) at such Examination or Account when they were present Ear-Witnesses, and then Assenters to the Credit thereof; all this doth not render them *No Witnesses*, much less T. R. a *Forger* for giving the World a true Account of the Matter, as it was sent up to him (and not contrived by him) by publishing amongst other Testimonies that *Certificate* that detected the *Baptists* Forgery from the Hands of several Witnesses, who really subscribed thereto, who withall certified and sent the Names of those Inhabitants present. The *Baptists* Boasts (about the said *Living Wonder*) are sufficiently detected in our Friends Answers thereto.

But *Jeremy* thinks he payes us off in several Passages we are now coming to, as in asking, *Whether it be not very Uncharitable for W. P. to Violate the Laws of God and the Laws of the King, in remembering any thing against those whom the King had graciously pardoned; else, that he would not have told Mr. Faldo in his Rejoynder, pag. 406. of the Nonconformists preaching up Blood and*

C

Treason,

Treason, and Garments rol'd in the Blood of Kings, &c?

I must tell *Jeremy*, That he hath herein dealt unfairly by *W. P.* and aggravated his Words by adding [ BLOOD and TREASON ] Whenas his Words are, ' They are ' true *Gospel-Ministers*, and their Feet truly ' Beautiful, whose *Gospel* is, *Peace on Earth*, ' and *Good-will towards Men*; and not Garments rol'd in the Blood of Kings and Princes, Rulers and People : No Worldly ' Armies, Battels, Spoils, Sequestrations, ' &c. Though its true, that *John Faldo* and his Brethren are retorted upon by *W. P.* for their Preaching up the former War; but this was not to violate the King's Favour in pardoning them, but to give them a Check for their being so busie against us in a Persecuting Spirit; and particularly, for *John Faldo's* Abuse of *William Penn*, and meddling with his deceased Father; about which I refer the Reader to *W. P.'s* own Answer to speak for himself, in his *Rejoyndr* to *John Faldo* ) pag 405, 406. And so *W. P.'s* Design might be rather to Humble them, and to reclaim them from that old bitter Spirit, wherein they were formerly Incendiaries, and yet bring forth their Invectives, tending

tending to stir up Persecution against the People of the Lord [ And have not both the Holy Prophets and Christ also reminded such a persecuting Generation, both of their own and their Fathers former Iniquities, seeing them continuing therein in the same Spirit of Envy ? ] But I doubt not but *W. P.* desires their Repentance, that they may be converted from their Persecuting Spirit, that they may receive Pardon from God as well as from the King.

But *Jeremy*, thou that wouldst seem so Zealous against Uncharitableness, and Violating the Laws of God and the King; hast thou dealt charitably by *E. Burroughs*, in saying, *it is dth justify the late Wars against the King?* and not only so, but thou art pleased to tell the World twice or thrice over, that *we justify the late Wars against the King.* How now, *Jeremy!* Is this thy Charity and Respect to the Laws of God and the King? Hast thou not herein shewn a persecuting Spirit to render us obnoxious? And why so? Because *E. B.* in severely Warning the late Powers of their Down-fall, did by way of Reproof tell *Oliver* what God had done for him, even in the same Letter to him wherein he plainly also telleth him of the Great Oppressions which the People of God suffered

suffered under him, both in their Persons and Estates; Saying also to Oliver, *If I perish I must speak the Truth; most of the Prisons this day & all thy Jurisdictions do testify the Unjust Judgments and Great Oppressions and Cruelties; yea, and further conditionally threatens Oliver, That God would confound and him; see E. B.'s Works, from pag. 551. to pag. 583. how plainly and faithfully he did warn Oliver, and those men then in Power, of their Overthrow. To be sure E. B. was no Temporizer; neither have we forborn in dealing plainly with those in Power, when we have had Cause, as the Lord hath moved and authorized us.*

And further to clear E. B. and the Re-printer or Publisher of his Books, as to their Freeness from being either a Factious Party, or Seditious to the Government that now is, and to manifest what a True Prophet he was (and that never man dealt more plainly) against the former Power and Government, particularly in his *Message to the then Rulers of England, fol. 594. viz. If you of the Army be alwayes Treacherous and Disobedient towards the Lord, and abuse your Power, and trifle away your Hour about Places of Honour, and such Self-seeking Matters, and the Cause of God be neglected*  
by



by you, and his People continu'd Oppressed Sufferers under you, as they have long been; even then shall you be cast aside with shameful Disgrace, and the Heavy Hand of the Lord shall be upon you in Judgment, and you shall be smitten more then any before you; your Estates shall not be spared from the Spoiler, nor your Squ's from the Pit, nor your Persons from the Violence of Men, no, nor your Necks from the Ax; for if you be Unfaithful, and continually Treacherous to the Cause of God, then shall you be left to the will of your Enemies, and they shall charge Treachery and Treason upon you, &c.

But our Opposer, who under the Pretence of Christianity and Charitableness, shews himself void of both, tells us of a Quakers Book, entituled, *The West answering to the North*, hath much to this Purpose, which (saith he) *I am not willing to write out, because I am not willing to expose you.* I cannot but observe the Man's Dissimulation and base Insinuation in this implicate Kind of accusing us, hereby to render us more suspicious and obnoxious, then if he had dealt plainly, especially whilst he accuseth us over and over with justifying the late wars against the King, whenas that very Book quoted by him, entituled, *The West answering to the North* printed 1657. doth in the whole Tenour of

it severely reprehend those then in Power, to wit, *Oliver* and his *Ministers* for their *Oppressions, Cruelties, and Arbitrary & Tyrannical Proceedings*, which they pretended to condemn those before them: though there might be some Words too harsh in the said Book as reflecting backward, but with an Intent to judge them then in Power; yet it is to be considered, as chiefly writ by two *Officers* or *Captains* of the old Army, being Common *Wealths Men* (as I understand) who had not as then wholly got over the *Warring Spirit*, however did sympathize with our *Poor, Innocent Friends*, when they beheld their deep *Sufferings*, as in some Degree sharing with them; though its probable, some Remainder of their former *Sharpness of Spirit* was left, wherein they had been animated by such *Zealous Chaplains* as *Jeremy*; yet those Books quoted by him were extant long before the *King's Pardon*, which he pretends so greatly to respect; but we have not gone about to serve him and his *Brethren* thus, as to rake up all the *Baptists Books* that concerned the former *War* and *Matters of State* before the *Kings* coming in, or *Act of Indemnity*: However, this we find Cause to believe, that, whatever *Respect J. Ives & his Brethren* may pretend, either to the *Kings*

*Gracious Pardon* or the *Law of Charity*, they would shew little Mercy if they had Power to execute their Enmity, as well as to render us obnoxious to the Government; such as *J. Ives* and his Brother *T. Hicks*, would in all Probability be as busie Agents for our Ruine, as they are now to endeavour it by such an *Indictment* as this (that is made up of their present Accusations against us) viz. *That you justifie the late Wars against the King; that you are No Christians, nor worthy of so venerable a Name; that your Doctrines are Destructive both to Scripture and Christian Religion; that your Confessions are gross Equivocations; that your Opinions do make void all Rules of Christian Faith and Practice; that your Friends of the Ministry are Impostors, false Prophets and Men of Lying Spirits: Thus far J. Ives. And then T. Hicks in his Dialogues against the Quakers, viz. That you are Destructive to all Human Society, Inconsistent with Government; that you are as vile Impostors as ever were; that your Religion is a meer Cheat, calculated to the Service of the Devil and your own Lusts, horrid Blasphemies; that your chief Motive and Inducement to suffer, is the Satisfaction of your Wills and Lusts, or the promoting of your Carnal Interests; that you are the Spawn of the wicked*

Brood, the Ranters and have like up their Vomit; Romish Emissaries; Hereticks; Mad Men; Infatuated; such as esteem the Holy Scriptures of no more Authority than Esop's Fables, and the Blood of Christ no more than an Unholy Thing, or the Blood of a Common Thief, yea worse; that you reprobate the Holy Scriptures and the Person of Christ; that you deny any future distinct Beings, Rewards or Eternal Advantages to Men after Death; that your owning Christ, and the Christ you own, is a meer Mystical Romance, and that your Meetings are to Inveigle and Trapan People; As also he recriminates the Quakers in General with the Enormities of some Particulars: These, with many more such like most bitter, false and absurd Invectives by *Tho. Hicks* the Baptist-Agent. O Persecuting Baptists! But God be thanked, that these Mens Horns are shortened; for if they were not, it is not unlikely but they would push and persecute as cruelly as their Invectives are Inveterate, and tend thereto; or as their *New-England* Brethren, whose Persecuting Spirits would not be satisfied without Innocent Blood.

Again *Jer. Ives*, goes about to impeach us with an Inconsistency, and to exhibit a pregnant

nant Proof by Retortion of our being No Christians ; In that the Quakers refuse the Oath of Allegiance, because they are against all Swearing, as being Inconsistent with Christianity, or living in the Life and Power of Christ, or under his Government ; and yet reckons that some among us swear, and for Instance he puts this Question, *what think you of William Mead, who with Others took an Oath ? And what think you of Gerrard Roberts, who together with John Osgood, who with others took their Oaths, as appears by their Answer to a Bill in Chancery.* To all which I reply from what I think.

1. I tell this *Inquisitor*, that I think they are all honest Men, fearing God, and Men conscientious towards him according to their Principle, and that they would not injure, or defraud or wrong any in their Properties or Rights ; and for what they do they dare appear before and answer the great God in the great Day of Judgment. However, if they were Conscientious, they are resolved they would not make this *Inquisitor* their Confessor ; for they neither expect Mercy nor Absolution from him.

2. I also think (and *William Mead, John Osgood & Gerrard Roberts* are satisfied) that they are able to give an honest Account of their

their Conscientious-Tenderness in this Case, and that according to a good Conscience, if in Love desired, or out of an honest Intention, or for a good End, without any Design of Injury towards them or their Profession: But they have no Cause to think that *Ier. Ives* doth enquire or accuse them to the World for any good End, or out of any Friendship to them, or Love to their Souls; but rather from a Design of Mischief or Injury, as the Tenour of his Discourse against them imports: Therefore they are resolved rather to suffer his Revilings, and endure his Clamours, then gratifie a mischievous Spirit, by giving him Account of their Affairs or Proceedings for their Properties & Rights, which only they seek for; and not to injure their Neighbours (or any Man else) in their Names, Persons or Estates.

3. That if either *Jeremy*, or any *Baptists*, or others for him, have made Search in *Chancery*, or do enquire of any Officers belonging thereto, *whether any of the Quakers have given in their Answer upon Oath?* I think that he and such his Enquirers are Busbodies in other mens Matters (while tis not their own Concernments). And whilst their Design and End therein is for Evil against our Friends, it might be suspected by those Officers

Officers in trust concerned, as not to be for Good towards them or us, in their Inquiry ; and that therefore such busie Inquisitors might justly have met with a Repulse, and been rejected, and not answer'd in their capitious Attempts.

4. To his falsely accusing the *Quakers* with daily impleading People at Law, I say, That though some of them have Occasion sometimes to make use of the Law, they are necessitated thereto, to maintain their just Rights & Properties from such Unconscionable Men as would otherwise make a Prey upon them, to Ruin them and theirs, and not to injure others, or defraud any of their Rights ; in such Cases the Law is used Lawfully, being for Justice and Right: Its probable that if the *Quakers* could neither make use of the Law, nor have their Answers accepted, for what's their own proper Rights, but be devoured by Unreasonable or Wicked Men, our Opposer would not be so offended, nor inquisitive as he is into our Friends Affairs ; but he would think it ill to be so dealt by : If his Brethren should be asked, What think you of Jeremy Ives, who boasts that he is able to approve himself as Honest in all his Correspondencies in the World as the best of the *Quakers* ?  
But

But hath he done so? hath he performed Promise and Covenant with all, and satisfied all his Creditors? have none of them had cause to complain of him in those Matters? Its not unlike but he would be very short at this, and give such an Answer as this, *What's that to you? meddle with your own Business: I will not make you my Confessor; or, I have done what I can to satisfy all, or so far as I was able:* And so our Friends can easily answer, *What's their Concerns to Jer. Ives?* What has he to do to question or accuse them therein? They have endeavoured to keep their Consciences in-offensive towards God and Men, as those that must give an Account to God, and not unto their Adversaries, who have no Jurisdiction over them or their Consciences.

5. I must take Leave further to enquire, seeing that *Jer. Ives* and *Henry Den* with divers others, have thus defined an Oath, viz. to say, *God is my Witness, God is my Record; I speak the Truth in Christ, I lye not; my Conscience beareth me Witness in the Holy Spirit, &c.* that these Expressions, with many more of the like Nature, are equivalent to an Oath; and these to evince, That the *Apostle Paul* himself sware; and that not only  
Christ,



Christ, but the Apostle did both practise, enjoin  
 and exact Swearing upon others; and to prove,  
 that he charged others to swear, J. I. cites  
 2 Tim. 4. 1. & 1 Thes. 5. 27. [Also J. Tombs  
 in his Supplement about Swearing, saith, *That*  
*the using these Speeches, I affirm before God, or*  
*this we say in the Presence of him that shall*  
*judge the Quick and the Dead, &c. is plain*  
*Swearing.*] Concerning which Definition and  
 Plea for Swearing under the Gospel, these  
 men are answered by that faithful Servant of  
 the Lord, and Sufferer for the Cause of Christ,  
 Samuel Fisher, in his *Antidote against Swea-*  
*ring*, and his *Supplementum Sublatum*. Now  
 suppose that any of our Friends find Freedom  
 to use some such Expressions in their Testi-  
 monies before Authority, as, *God is my Wit-*  
*ness; I speak the Truth in the Presence of God;*  
*or I speak in the Fear of God; or, God knows*  
*I lye not,* and this without Regret or Scruple  
 of Conscience; and suppose what they say,  
 be believed and accepted of, as equivalent to  
 an Oath; and that those Magistrates or Mi-  
 nisters in Trust are satisfied therewith, and  
 do not think it prejudicial to their Consci-  
 ences to accept thereof; what Instruction  
 has Jeremy to give in such Cases? What has  
 he to do to shew himself a *Busie Body* in other  
 Men's Matters? And why should he rake  
 into

into his Neighbours Affairs; either to find out Occasion against them, or to prejudice them in their Properties? Should not *Jeremy's* Business rather be, to convince the *Quakers* of the real Definition of an Oath, that they may not interfere with their Principle, rather than to seek to make them odious to the World, as Men perfidious therein? For (this is not the Way to persuade them to *Jeremy's* Christianity) they would not willingly or wittingly profess one Thing and practise another: Thus far I have signified what I really think, in Answer to *Jeremy's* Question.

As for his high Charge, viz.

1. *How Impious then are the Quakers, who some of them swear themselves. and most of them take Pleasure in them that do so?*

2. *Can Quakers be Men of Conscience and Integrity, that while they judge Swearing, will procure Men to swear?*

Both which are manifestly false; for they neither take Pleasure therein, nor procure Men to swear: if any of them have Occasion for *Witnesses* that do not scruple an Oath, it is the *Magistrates*, not the *Quakers*, that put them upon, or tender them an Oath; for if their Testimony without an Oath might be accepted, the *Quakers* would be

'e better satisfied: Let the *Magistrates* enjoin them to speak Truth upon what Penalty they shall see meet; we have proposed this for our selves as well as others.

Whereas *Jeremy* takes the Grant, that *W. P.* gave to his Request for a Meeting to be upon *Dishonourable* or *Impossible Conditions*, and so worse then a *Down-right Denyal*; of which he first mentio<sup>n</sup>eth that, *If Air. Kiffin, Mr. Plants, Mr. Dike and Mr. Hicks* will give it under their Hands, that they will be bound to stand to what *Jeremy* shall Answer, Propose, Affirm or Deny.

*W. P.*'s first Propo<sup>s</sup>al runs thus: viz. 1<sup>st</sup>, Let *Jeremy Ives* make it appear to us, that he is deputed to this Work; for it is beneath US to engage against a single Person, as well as beside our Business, as the Case lieth, to think our selves concerned in his *Rodemontado's* and vapouring Challenges: He is Privateer but for himself, and stands upon no Body's Legs but his own, and some think, not alwayes well on them neither.

And why is this Impossible? I suppose he doth not count it Dishonourable to be Deputed: But if then Impossible, it argues, they have not so much Confidence in *Jeremy* as he has in himself, and that they think not fit to  
embargo

*embarque their Cause in that Bottom: And what Reason is there then for a whole Body of People to subject themselves to the imperious Daring and Examination of such a singular boasting Bravado, if his own Brethren cannot confide in, nor subject their Cause to him; and then is it reasonable We should meet him alone without a Deputation from them to this Work?*

Another Condition is, *That all we have against T. H. may be first debated; and this is but reasonable, and J. I. unreasonable in interposing to divert our Prosecution of this: The Condition is thus laid down by W. P.*

2. *That he (to wit, Jeremy Ives) personate T. Hicks, as to the Matter charged by us against him, to wit, of writing Forgeries, Perversions and Slanders.*

3. *That before he enters upon proving us No Christians, he would tell us what a True Christian is, or we go by no Standard.*

4. *Prove to us that he is that Christian, or else he is unfit to prove another No Christian.*

5. *That we are not such Christians, but Hereticks and Impostors.*

To our proposing that what we have against T. H. may be first debated, *Jer.* tells us, that we will not vindicate the Honour of our Profession, till we have vindicated the Honour of our Personal

*Personal Reputations, as being more zealous thereof than of the Honour of God and Religion.* This is a gross and apparent Untruth; for both our Religion and Principles, as well as our Personal Reputations are concern'd in our Charge against *Tho. Hicks*, as appears plainly both in his *Forgeries, Perversions and Slanders*, which concern both Doctrine and Practice: but it seems *Jeremy* is very raw, and unvers'd in the Controversies between us, and yet his Confidence will serve him to engage in the Quarrel for *Tho. Hicks*.

To the second; He counts this *another of our poor Put-offs, and Unreasonable, that he should make good any more than he has charg'd against us*: He counts it unreasonable then to personate *T. H.* in the Matter that we charge against him, was it not then Unreasonable he should so deeply engage for him before? But *Jeremy* says, *He is ready to make good what he has charg'd against us, by the Grace of God, if we DARE meet him.* But this is to be understood as a distinct Offer of it self, without Respect to the Matter about *Tho. Hicks*: However, it is but single Daring and Vapouring *Jeremy* still, whose Brags and Attempts we value not, but slight his Folly therein.

To the third: He counts this *impertinent*,  
*When, saith he, we tell them they are no Chri-*  
*istians either of one sort or another; This he*  
*tells the Quakers, and it is but his own telling;*  
*and I do not think but he doth in this violate*  
*some better Perswasions and Convictions,*  
*that he has had in himself: And while he*  
*confesseth, that he is a good Christian, that*  
*hath a Rule for his Faith and Practise in the*  
*Christian-Religion, and endeaours to the ut-*  
*tirmost of his Strength and Understanding to*  
*believe and live accordingly. He concludes,*  
*they are No Christians that have no Rule for*  
*their Faith and Practise in the Christian-*  
*Religion; and such are the Quakers, saith*  
*he, pag. 14. See what an Imperious and*  
*Censorious Judge this is: He says, we have*  
*No Rule, though we profess, believe and*  
*practically own the Guidance of the Spirit*  
*of Christ, and in Subjection thereto do own*  
*the Holy Scriptures: And for our Lives and*  
*Conversations, I hope he doth not conclude,*  
*that either the People called Quakers, in ge-*  
*neral are therein Unchristian, or that his own*  
*is more Christian then theirs; how comes*  
*he then to presume, that we have not the Spi-*  
*rit of Christ, or none of his Light in us for*  
*a Rule, in affirming, that the Quakers have*  
*No*

*No Rule for their Faith and Practice in the Christian-Religion?*

But this Presumption is not strange to us, since he could openly tell *William Gibson* and me, that *We* were not enlightened with the Light of Christ.

I could not but then take notice of the Man's Insolency and Foolish Cenſorioness; but how doth he prove that the *Quakers* have *No Rule for their Faith and Practice in the Christian-Religion*. and therefore are no Christians? He thus attempts it, viz.

*That* though *George Keith*, to keep up your Credit with the People, said, *The Scriptures* were onned by you as a Secondary Rule for your Faith and Practice; yet *Edw. Burroughs* contradicts him, and tells us in so many words, *That the Scriptures are NO Rule or Guide of Faith and Life to the Saints*; see his Works, fol. 515. and reconcile your Prophets as well as you can. Thus far *Jeremy*.

He would make the World believe, that he has here given the *Quakers* a deadly Blow, in rendring their Prophets irreconcilable; yea, and to fasten the Contradiction, he saith, that *E. B.* tells us in so many words, *That the Scriptures are NO RULE or Guide of Faith, &c.* for this he bids us see his Works, fol. 515.

How now, bold *Jeremy*! I have seen the place quoted by thee, and thou hast manifestly belyed *Edw. Burroughs*, to prove thy false Charge; for *Edward's* Words in the place are thus, viz. *The Scriptures are profitable, and were given forth to be read and to be fulfilled; yet they are not THE RULE and Guide of Faith and Life unto the Saints; but the SPIRIT of God, that gave forth the Scriptures, that is THE RULE and Guide, Teacher and Leader into all Truth: See also his following words in the next Clause, affirming, That the Scriptures are the Words of God; that the Spirit of God is THE RULE of Faith and Life to the Saints; that men ought to search the Scriptures, and believe what is therein written, &c.*

See now *Jeremy*, that *Edward Burroughs* his words are not as thou citest them, that *the Scriptures are NO RULE*, but that they are not *THE RULE* and Guide of Faith and Life unto the Saints, but the Spirit; and yet the Scriptures to be Searched, Read and Fulfilled: so that here he denyes them not, but plainly implies them to be *A RULE*, but not *THE RULE*, that is, not the most Eminent or Highest Rule, but the Spirit: And how doth this contradict *George Keith's* saying, *That we own the*  
 Scrip-



*Scriptures as a Secondary Rule?* which also implies a primary or Principal Rule, to wit, the *Holy Spirit*, as well as *E. B.* doth in his words before. For my part, I cannot understand any more Contradiction between saying, *The Scriptures are a Secondary Rule*, and yet not *THE RULE* and Guide of Faith and Life unto the Saints, then there is between saying, *Jeremy Ives is a Baptist Preacher*, and yet not the principal Preacher among them; or between *Jeremy Ives's being a Man*, and yet not the Chief (or Best) of Men; though I confess this too mean an Instance for the Subject before, but only somewhat to illustrate the Distinction. I was unwilling to have charged *Jeremy* with *Forgery* (from the Place he quotes) in saying, that *E. B.* tells us in so many words, that the *Scriptures are NO Rule*: But now upon Enquiry and Search into his Falshood herein, I am satisfied that I should do him no Wrong to charge It upon him, and let the Place quoted by him in *E. B.'s Works* determine it.

Again, I find no Inconsistency between *William Smith's* confessing *Christ and the Spirit of God to be the Rule* \* for trying *Spirits, searching the Heart, and not the Scriptures* (yet confessing them

\* As in his  
*Primer*, pag.  
10, 11, 12.

to be of great Service) and *G.K's* owning the Scriptures for a *Secondary Rule*, that Christ should be preferred before and above the Scriptures, both as to trying and *d-scove-ring*, and yet they serviceable in their place, as Christ opens the Understanding in them, can be no Opposition.

But *Jeremy* objects, That the Quakers deny the Scriptures to be a *Rule of Faith and Practice*, comprehensive of the whole Duty of Man.

1. That they are so comprehensive as declaring the whole Duty of Man, respecting Faith and Practice (as to the Sum and Substance thereof, respecting Man's Salvation) I know none of us deny: But that they are not that Manifesting Rule of every particular Act of Faith and Obedience that God may require respectively, I think this Opposer cannot deny; but that he hath granted thus much at sundry Discourses, as with respect to such Prophets and Messengers, as God might, for ought he knew, raise up in these dayes, and peculiarly commisionate and send forth with extraordinary Messages to particular Places and Peoples, in which God only (by his Spirit) is their great *Rule and Guide*. 2. And so God is in discovering to Man his inward Estate and  
Con-

Condition, even the Thoughts and Inclinations of his Heart, with all his Particular Actions.

But sayes *Jer. Ives*, *They pretend that the Spirit is the Rule, when they give no more Evidence of it then Mahomet or Muggleton.*

But this is manifest Reproach and Falshood: We give as much Evidence, both in Doctrine and Conversation, as is necessary to evince our *Christianity*; And as *Jeremy* cannot disprove, nor doth he appear to be a Man of that Spiritual Mind and Judgment, as to know what Evidence we have given, or what Evidence we can give, his Comparison is gross and impious; and Neither *It*, nor his bare Charge (nor yet his calling upon us to produce an Evidence of the Spirit) shall serve his turn to prove us either *No Christians* or *Impostors*.

Another Condition for a Meeting is, *That Jeremy prove himself that Christian, or else he is unfit to prove another No Christian*: To this he saith, *But is not this pretty? As they define a Christian, there is no Christian but themselves; and when I have proved myself a Christian, which by Interpretation is a Quaker, then I think the Question will be out of Question.*

To this I reply : I must needs look upon this as a very sorry Shift ; for, but in the very Condition before he is told, *That before he enters upon proving us No Christians, he would tell us what a True Christian is, or we go by no Standard.* See now here, how plainly this provides, *first*, for an Agreement upon the Definition of a True Christian, even such, as both *Jeremy* and the *Quakers* might agree upon : Is it not reasonable, that the Terms of a Proposition, or Matter in Question, should be explained and agreed upon in all *Controversies*? and also reasonable, that when it is agreed what a True Christian is, that *Jeremy* should prove himself one before he be admitted to prove others none? And did the *Quakers* herein propose either to be the *sole Judges*, who is a True Christian? or have they hereby demerited this man's Sleight and Derision he thus taunteth them with? viz. *Would it not make one smile to see the sad Shifts the Poor Men are put to? And what sad Shifts? What! to agree upon the Definition of a Christian, as a Standard to go by; and then for Jeremy to prove himself that Christian first: else, What Credit can his Attempts be of, while he doth not prosecute others as a Christian, or Partaker*  
of

of *Christianity* him self; Seeing he has so hideously charg'd others with being *no Christians?*

And further; It is not only the *Quakers*, but many others, that look upon *Jer. Ives* to be no True *Christian*, or worthy to bear that Name, or undertake in the *Behalf* of all *Christians*, to prove the *Quakers* none, as he promileth, to produce a *Deputation* from the *Baptists*, if he can obtain it. Well, I'll assure him, if he doth, we will take it for granted, that the *Baptists* make him their great Agent, and we will look upon their Cause as highly concerned in him, and so far resigned to him; let him do what he can to maintain it, we are not at all doubtful on our parts of a good Issue for the Truth. And seeing *Jeremy* pretendeth his Endeavours for such a *Deputation* from the *Baptists*, shall be to leave us naked of all *Excuse*; we expect that it shall not be to evade those Conditions before proposed by *William Penn*, in his Paper against *Jeremy Ives* his Challenge; otherwise, if he should procure it to evade and shuffle off our Proceeding on those *Conductions*, we shall but look upon it as a *Flam*, and a *vapouring Colour*, and *Diversions*, like his *Interposing* and *Vaunting Challenge*, tending to *Divert* or keep us off from the Pursuance of our Charge against his Brother

ther *Tho. Hicks*, whom with his *Abettors* we charge with being guilty of *Forgery, Slanders, &c.*

He hath a Fling at *S. Eccles*, charging him, that he saith of *G. Fox*, *That it may be said of him, as it was said of Christ, that the World was made by him, though the World knew him not; and then addeth, Is not this a rare Christian?* p. 15.

Unto which I must tell *Jeremy*, That in my Understanding he hath both unfairly cited and interpreted *S. E.* in this Matter; for if so be that he could say or intend, that *The World was made by him*, did relate to *G. Fox* as well as to *Christ*, then I must confess with *Jeremy*, that he was more fit for *Bedlam* then otherwise: But if he alludes only to *The World knew him not* (which related to *Christ*) that so it may be said of this True Prophet, *G. F.* (as *S. E.*'s sense) then I cannot see why *Jeremy* *Ives* should so deride him, although he might have better and more safely worded his Intention: yet it is Uncharitable

\* *As* [the World knew him not] *should only be the Antecedent to* [so it may be said of this true Prophet, *G. F.*] *and not that the World was made by him.*

to reflect upon a Man's Christianity for a little Failer in Syntax, \* which can only be imputed to *S. E.* in this Matter,

Matter, according to the Law of Charity; let him speak for himself, see our Friends Book, entituled, *Judas and the Jews*, p.75. viz. 'I did not say, nor did I ever believe, 'that the World was made by G. F. but by 'Christ. who was in the World, and the 'World knew him not; so I say, it may be 'said of G. F. the World knows him not, 'though he be in the World, as was said of 'Christ, *He was in the World, though not of 'the World, and the World knew him not; 'and he said of his Followers, Ye are not 'of the World, as I am not of the World*, Jo. 17. '16. and *I have chosen you out of the World*, 'Jo. 15.19. See here how plainly S. F. hath signified his Intention in this Matter: And what but Prejudice and Enmity can otherwise contrive his words?

Finally. be it remembred, that *Jeremy's* Charge, that makes such a Hideous Noise, viz. *That our Ministers are Impostors, and Men of Lying Spirits*, did proceed from his *Uncharitableness*, or at least, *his Breach of the Laws of Good Manners*, according to his own Observation, pag.5. where he hath promised, *Not to break the Laws of Good Manners, to call our Friends Papers Lyes, and Forgeries*: So that herein he standeth a Self-condemned Person, not only

breaking the *Laws of Good Manners*, according to his own Confession, but pursuing for a further Breach thereof; in which he also hath bespoken himself to be *No Christian*, condemning that in others which he allows in himself; as is fully prov'd before against him.

*To his POSTSCRIPT.*

*First*, For *Idle and Ridiculous Opinions and Practices*, as he would charge upon us in general: I do not yet find that he hath found them, *in such Books and Persons as the Quakers declar'dly own*, as his words are; that Work is yet to do for ought I see.

*Secondly*, Suppose there were any *Ab-surd Opinions* contained in any Book or Books, said to be published in the *Quakers Names* and Behalf, if they have not publickly declared against them, I deny that their Silence herein may reasonably pass for Consent and Approbation, as *Jeremy* concludes; for its possible there may be Books said to be published in the *Quakers Names* and Behalf, which few, if any of the *Quakers* have ever read; and it were Unreasonable to charge those things upon them, or upon the whole Body of them, which they have had no hand in, nor been made privy to; neither would

*Jeremy*



*Jeremy Ives* or his Brethren be so served. Besides there may be Books writ on the Behalf of a People by indifferent Persons, which are not wholly to be condemned, or publickly declared against for some particular Faults or Escapes where the Intent of the Writer was honest, and the greatest Part or Substance of the Matter serious and true.

*Thirdly* Our Adversary asks, *why do not the Body of the Quakers meet together and agree to publish an Index Expurgatorious, to clear themselves of such Books they do not own; otherwise it will not be their Private Apologizing for themselves, when their Credit lies at stake, to say, they do not own this and the other Book, that will pass for Excuses among Wise Men.*

1. I must confess, if he had good Ground for this Proposition, there seems to be some Reason in it more then he has shewn before: But I would ask this Law-Maker, if he doth really look upon the Body of the *Quakers* to be attained to so much of sound Judgment and Understanding, as here he seems to imply, that is as able to clear themselves of such Books & Things, as they are liable to be called in question for, or as are unsound?

2. His granting that there are such Books as we do not own (and which tend to the

Hazard of our Credit, if we do not publish an *Index* to clear our selves thereof: This implies, that we have a Judgment to clear our selves, and that so far the Light or Truth is risen amongst us, as not to own those things which may indanger our Credit; and then he should not charge us with those things, unless we did own them.

Again, As we do not reckon our selves bound so far to take Cognizance of every Book or Paper, so as to read all over that hath been writ by all that have gone under the Name *Quakers*; so neither do we know Occasion to write such an *Index* as *Ier my* prescribes, against any of our Friends Books that are declaredly owned by us.

For those Opinions and Practices that are generally owned by us, we stand to maintain, as neither being *Idle* nor *Ridiculous*, but Serious and Sound, agreeable to the holy Scriptures, and consistent with *Christianity*, and value not all the *Gain-sayings* of our Adversaries: But if any Practice or Signal Thing extraordinary be laid upon any one Particular among us, we impose it not upon others; and such must not stand or fall to Man's Judgment, but are accountable to God for what they do; For to Man's Judgment and Earthly Wisdom many things  
ex-

extraordinary or peculiar, which were required of God's Prophets, might seem both *Idle & Ridiculous*, and those Prophets themselves seem Fools and Mad Men, as they were accounted of old.

But further, seeing *Jeremy Ives* has before prescribed such a Method, as the *Body of the Quakers to meet together, and agree to publish an Index Expurgatorious, &c.* They that prescribe Rules, should be regular themselves; and they that make Laws should observe and keep Laws. Why do not the *Baptists* (who deem themselves *Christians* and *Us* none) begin, and shew *Us* such an Example, as he hath prescribed? since there are divers Opinions Contradictory one to another in the *Baptists* Books, both whereof cannot be true; as between the *Predestinarian* Principle and the *Arminian* (so called) or between an absolute *Predestination* of particular Persons to Salvation or Damnation from Eternity, and the *General Grace* of God, and *Redemption in Christ* for all men; And between the *Impossibility* of Believers falling from Grace, and the *Possibility* thereof, with divers other things, about which the *Baptists* differ among themselves. Why do not the *Body of the Baptists* meet together, & agree first about their own Principles, and then

With a Declaration against those Opinions which may appear inconsistent with *Christianity, Truth and Reason*, and an *Index Expurgatorium* to clear themselves of all such *Baptists Books* as are writ to maintain such an Exploded Opinion, that People may no longer be deceived thereby? otherwise, if they refuse this Proposition, begun by *Jeremy*, we may accordingly take the *Baptists Silence* herein, to pass for Consent and Approbation of all the *Baptists Books*, which the Body of *Baptists* have not publicly declared against: And then from hence I charge *Jer. Ives* and his *Brethren*, with giving their Consent and Approbation to their Brother *Thomas Hicks* his Three Fictitious *Dialogues*, and all the *Absurdities, Contradictions, Forgeries and Abuses* therein contain'd, so long as they are silent, and do not write an *Index Expurgatorium*, to clear themselves thereof; and so of all the rest of the *Baptists Books*, that contain in them both *Idle, Ridiculous and Contradictory Opinions*.

Further, *Jeremy* accuseth us with *Enthusiastick Principles, and new Articles of Faith and Practice* frequently enjoyned by *Immediate Inspiration*.

1st. What he means by the Word *Enthusiastick*, or *Enthusiasts*, which disdainfully he casts

casts upon us, he seems to intimate, that it is such as pretend *Revelation from Heaven*, and *Immediate Inspiration for their Rule*: It seems he pretends to neither, but rather derides thereat, like the Scoffers of the Times: And how came he to get this word *Enthusiast*? He should withal have told us its proper Definition, and then it would have appeared more plainly in what Sense he useth it. But I would ask him, if the *Baptists* at their first coming forth were not counted *Enthusiasts* by their Persecutors, when they profest the Help of the Spirit, or Immediate Inspiration in their Praying and Preaching, and the Sufficiency of the Spirit's Teaching, as *Samuel How*, *William Kiffin*, and many others did formerly? And how many of them did preach up and esteem the Inward Work of the Spirit and Grace of God in the Heart? which, it seems *Jeremy*, thou hast either had very little Experience of, or else art greatly apostatized, and become a Hard-hearted Mocker at the Acknowledgment of *Immediate Inspiration*, which Principle thou wilt not confute by calling us *Idle Enthusiasts*.

2. Its an idle Untruth in thee to accule us with frequently enjoyning *New Articles of Faith and Practice*, either by *Immediate Inspiration* or *Pretence thereof*; neither hast thou

thou shewn us what those Articles are, that thou sayest are thus frequently enjoyned?

Again, I cannot but observe how Senselessly and Atheistically thou talkest, in concluding, *That if a man pretends a Revelation from Heaven, or Immediate Inspiration for a Practice that's Absurd, the Quakers cannot Reprove him by Immediate Inspiration, because he pretends to that for his Practice as well as they.*

It seems *Immediate Inspiration* is of a very little Esteem with thee, and of as little Use with thee: If because some falsely pretend it for that which is Absurd, others cannot thereby Reprove him for it; at this rate of Arguing the True Prophets Mouthes should have been stopt from Repeating the False, because they pretended the same the True did, and could say, *Thus saith the Lord, &c.* And likewise the True Apostles should not have Repeated the False, because they pretended the same thing doubtless, when they transform'd themselves as the Ministers of Christ.

But if by *Immediate Inspiration* Absurd or Evil Actions cannot be reprov'd where the same is but pretended, then farewell all true Christianity, true Saviour, true Sense and Judgment. But doth not the Spirit of God  
search

search all things, and the Spiritual Man judge all things? Surely if this man did really own that there's any such thing in being now, as either *Revelation from Heaven*, or *Immediate Inspiration*, or that there is a *True God*, and that *He is Known*, he durst not talk at this idle sleighting rate, as he doth, about *Immediate Inspiration*, as not a sufficient Rule to reprove Absurdities, where *It* can but be pretended for them. But yet a little before he grants a *super-natural Evidence*, that if we can give some *super-natural Evidence* why we should be received, as namelv, in writing against the *absurd Opinions* of such as pretend they are revealed to them; but what *Supernatural Evidence* this is that he means, he tells us not, while he does not own the Sufficiency of *Immediate Inspiration* to reprove absurd or evil Practices & Opinions by: for if a *supernatural Evidence* doth not attend *Immediate Inspiration*, or *Revelation from Heaven*, it is no where to be found; then it follows, the Spirit is insufficient to evidence it self, or it is not Self evidencing, and such Doctrine as this will at length lead some to be such *Fools* and *Atheists* as to say in their Hearts, *There is No God*: But I tell this Adversary to *Immediate Inspiration*, That the Spirit of God can no more be without a super-

super-natural Evidence, then the Sun can be without its Light ; God has given an Universal Evidence thereof by his Light in all men's Consciences, which answers to the Spirit's Testimony and Ministry in the Ministers of the Spirit, which men may evidently see, if they close not their Eyes, or harden not their Hearts to cause their own Stumbling and Overthrow.

In order to a manifest Decision of the chief Matters in Controversie, I desire *Jes. Ives.* or any of his Brethren for him, to give a plain and ingenuous Answer to these *Questions*, distinctly.

I. Whether Immediate Inspiration and Revelation from Heaven, are in Being in the True Church in these dayes, yea, or nay ?

II. Whether Immediate Inspiration be not necessary to the being of a True *Christian* or *Jew* inward ?

III. What super-natural Evidence or necessary Proof doth *J. I.* require of any ones having Immediate Inspiration from God ?

IV. Whether any one be fit to try (or judge of) a Super-natural Evidence, or Immediate Inspiration in another, but such a one as doth acknowledge and partake of immediate Inspiration in himself ?



V. Whether he that undertakes to prove others *No Christians*, ought not to be a *True Christian*, and first to approve himself such a one upon a true and undeniable Definition of a *True Christian*? [*Thou Hypocrite, first cast out the Beam out of thine own Eye, &c.*]

VI. What is the true and proper Signification and Discrimination of *Enthusiast* and *Impostor*? and so the real Derivation of *Enthusiasm* and *Imposture*? And whether there be not a plain Difference in the Nature of the Words? For Words and Terms, where either difficult or doubtful, must be explained before Matters can be clearly discussed thereupon.

VII. Whether it be not an Undervaluing of immediate Inspiration, for any to hold, *That thereby men cannot Reprove an Absurd Opinion or Practice in such as pretend a Revelation from Heaven for it*?

VIII. Whether the Apostles and primitive *Christians* were obliged to produce an Evidence of their Faith and Practice by Inspiration at the Demand of their Enemies, or only when God call'd them thereunto?

IX. Whether to require an Evidence for our Faith by immediate Inspiration be not all one as to put us upon proving our selves *Christians*, or equivalent thereto?

X. Whether it be proper or reasonable for

for one that has charged us with being *Impostors* and *Men of Lying Spirits*, and promised to prove it, instead thereof to require a Proof or Evidence from us of our being *immediately* or *divinely inspired*; and if we do not at his Demand produce such Evidence as he requireth, to conclude us *Impostors*?

XI. And how does *Jeremy Ives* prove his Call to *Dip or Plunge People in Water*? Or what Evidence can he produce for *His particular Call* thereto?

XII. And whether he does profess any Immediate Inspiration and Revelation from Heaven for his Dipping People? if he doth, what super-natural Evidence can he produce for it? if he doth not, whether he may not be deemed an *Impostor* therein?

XIII. Whether divers of the *Baptist-Preachers* have not heretofore imposed their *Water-Baptism* as Gospel, or as a thing necessary to Salvation, and so to the being of a *Christian* and Church of Christ, threatening & affrighting many simple People into Water upon pain of Damnation or the Curse; some by telling them, *They must Dip or Damn*?

XIV. Whether the *Baptists* are of the same Opinion still, *That their Water-Baptism or Dipping is Gospel, necessary to Salvation, or to be practised upon pain of Damnation*?

XV.

X V. And how proves *Jeremy Ives*, that the *One Baptism* (spoaken of *Ephes. 4.*) is that of *Water*? And whether his Instance of *Lords many* for *divers Baptisms*, as of *Water*, & *Affliction*, and the *Holy Ghost*, were a pertinent and meet Instance and Comparison, as between *One Lord Jesus*, and but *One proper Baptism*, to wit, *that of Water*, and between the *Lords many* & *divers Baptisms*, to wit, of *Afflictions*, and the *Holy Ghost*? see his *Quakers Quaking*, p. 38.

X V I. And what Call, Gospe'-Rule; or Precept, have *Baptists* for Night Dipping, and Fleeing or Abfenting from Meetings in Times of Persecution? And whether their envious Invectives and abusive Pamphlets, now in Times of Peace against their Neighbours, do not proceed from the same cowardly Spirit, which acted them in Times of Suffering?

X V I I. After the *Baptists* have try'd their Strength, made Enquiry of Apostates, and searched Books and Courts, to pick out Occasions against us, to render us as Vile as they can, and not only *no Christians*, but inconsistent with Government, and all this, if possible, to destroy us; May they not justly expect, that their Mischief will return upon their own Heads, and that they will fall into the Pit which they dig for others. XVIII.

XVIII. If they persist in this their course of Envy against us, whether they may not, as men conscious, justly expect a publick Reprehension; we having Occasion sufficient out of their own Books and former Proceedings, to exhibit a *History of Anabaptists*, both with relation to Religion and Government? For our parts, we value not their Envy, nor the Worst they can do, but are at Defiance with it; knowing also that *Christi-an-Life and Spirit*, that shall out-live their inveterate Enmity, who are Confederates against us; and we shall therein be further manifest, and Encrease, but they shall Decreaſe.

XIX. I would further ask, if *Jer Ives* and his Brethren do not own them to be *Christians* whom they Baptize?

XX. And what Evidence of their Faith or *Christianity* do those their Baptiz'd Believers produce? Answer the.e.

I have taken Occasion of late Time to take Notice of *Jeremy Ives's* former Envy, Confusion, Ignorance and Abuse, that he has shewn against the People call'd *Quakers* in his two Books; the one entituled, *The Quakers Quaking*, printed in the Year 1655. and the other entituled, *Innocency above Impudency*, printed 1656. which I had a mind

mind to have given the Reader some Hints of, but for Brevity's sake I reserve them to a further Opportunity, if Occasion be given me; Though I am rather desirous, that our *Daring Opposer* may by the Light of Christ consider his Wayes, and Repent of his Evil, then be concerned in *Contests* with him: For, God knows, I contend not for *Contention*, but for *Truth's* sake.

Reader, If that Passage in the 8th Page of this *Treatise* touching *Jer. Ives* his calling *Arthur Cook*, *Pittiful Fool*, and *Knave*, and *Loggerhead*, on the *Exchange*, should be doubted of; This may inform, that I have several *Certificates* thereof, under the hands of credible Persons.

G. W.

---

Pag. 12 lin 21. for of *Faith* read of our *Faith*. p. 16.  
 l. 24. r. a *Meeting* again. pag. 23. l. 12. f. had r. bath.  
 p. 30. l. 12. r. *saith*, that now God is. pag. 32. lin. 14.  
 f his r is. p. 36. l. 7. r. confound and break.

---

THE END.